

**CITY OF WEST DES MOINES  
DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING  
CITY COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING  
City Hall Training Room  
Thursday, February 7, 2013**

**Attending:**

Council Member Ted Ohmart	City Engineer Duane Wittstock
Council Member Jim Sandager	Principal Engineer Brian Hemesath
Deputy City Manager/City Clerk Jody Smith	City Attorney Dick Scieszinski
Development Planning and Inspection Manager Christopher Shires	Assistant to the City Manager Aaron Chittenden
Community Economic and Development Director Clyde Evans	Deputy Public Works Director Joe Cory
Chief Building Official Rod Van Genderen	Kara Tragesser, Planner

**Guests:**

Jerry Oliver, Civil Engineering Consultants (Item #1)	Rob Denhert, Assistant EMS Chief (Item #2)
Pete Hosch, Hy-Vee (Item #1)	
Jeff Stein, Hy-Vee (Item #1)	

The meeting of the Development and Planning City Council Subcommittee was called to order at 7:32 a.m.

**1. Hy-Vee Store on Valley West Drive Remodel – Jeff Stein, Hy-Vee; Pete Hosch, Hy-Vee; Jerry Oliver, CEC (30 min.)**

Mr. Shires spoke briefly noting that Hy-Vee would like to remodel their store on Valley West Drive and are not proposing any changes to the existing layout or parking lot. The significant code issue on this site is storm water management, of which there is little or no storm water detention. As they have no additional Minor Modification requests available for this site, their proposal will require a Major Modification review, which requires sites be reviewed for code compliance including compliance with storm water detention.

Mr. Hosch explained that they are in the process of extending their lease on the property and are proposing a major interior remodel. They have no plans to enlarge the building but they do propose to modify the front entrances from two (2) entrances to a single entrance and update the building facade. The challenge will be the costs and physical constraints associated with bringing the site into full compliance with storm water requirements. They are proposing to add underground detention in the front parking lot to provide the required detention for approximately one-half of the site.

Mr. Stein added that the site consists of two halves, generally the building and the parking lot, with the storm water coming from the building going to the rear of the building. An underground detention area could be constructed along the rear of the building but the cost is prohibitive and it could cause damage to the building foundation.

Council member Mr. Sandager inquired when the rear of the property could be considered for detention. Mr. Hosch answered that it would be readdressed at full redevelopment stage of the site.

Council member Sandager inquired how much the underground storm water detention would cost if it were in the front of the building. It was estimated that it would be approximately \$195,000 which would include tearing out the parking lot and replacing it. The rear of the property would cost between \$600,000-\$700,000.

Mr. Hemesath commented that staff hasn't yet received a full set of calculations to review. Approximately the east half of the property would be in compliance with City standards but the west half would not. The site was originally developed as one with the former SteinMart property to the south. Looking at the site as a whole, the ideal location

for the storm water would be in the southeast corner of the site. Since the parcel is now split, there are issues with containing the water on the Hy-Vee site. There are existing downstream storm water flooding issues, including but not limited to, the intersection of Valley West Drive and Westtown Parkway.

Mr. Wittstock added that in the past City Council has allowed other sites similar to develop with the condition of developing a plan that showed full compliance and a time table for implementation.

Council Member Sandager stated that he is appreciative that they're working on improving the site.

Brief discussion was conducted regarding the possibility of obtaining an easement from the adjoining Monkey Joe's site. Mr. Shires noted that the Monkey Joe parcel has the same issue with storm water detention as the Hy-Vee site does.

Council Member Sandager asked if a long term solution would be to share the costs associated with the storm water detention. Mr. Wittstock said that would be an ideal solution if possible.

Council Member Ohmart inquired if the site was in full compliance when the building was constructed to the standards at that time. Mr. Hemesath replied that the detention was completed in three (3) locations in the parking lot and typically parking lot detention isn't deep enough to provide adequate storage capacity. Given that fact, it is likely not in compliance with the old standards.

Council Member Ohmart stated that with redevelopment of sites it's difficult to bring them up to current standards, especially where it's cost prohibitive. Fifty percent (50%) compliance now would be an improvement with the redevelopment of the site. However, the negative aspect is the storm water issues downstream.

Council Member Sandager commented that he is comfortable with Hy-Vee's proposal but would like to be provided a timeline in which to bring the site into full compliance of the storm water detention.

Mr. Wittstock added that in order to remain consistent with what has been required in the past is that the applicant provides a full compliance plan and timeline of when the work will be completed.

Council Member Ohmart indicated agreement with Council Member Sandager's comments.

As review, Mr. Hosch recited the options available to them: 1) full compliance based on redevelopment of the site; and 2) working with the adjacent land owner if and when they redevelop and when the applicant submits a Major Modification for their site. Mr. Hosch responded that the timeline may be an issue so if it could be stated so that at the time of redevelopment of the site it would become compliant versus a specific date.

*Direction: The subcommittee asked that the applicant to work with City staff to prepare a full compliance plan and determine a timeline in which it could be accomplished.*

## **2. Public Safety Station 19 Communications Tower – Rob Denhert, Assistant EMS Chief (10 min.)**

Mr. Shires highlighted the project noting that EMS would like to install a communications tower at Station 19. The property is zoned as a Planned Unit Development (PUD) and as part of the ordinance, received zoning approval for a 75 foot communications tower. However, as there are now residences existing that weren't there at the time that this request went through the process, it could be considered controversial. One option is to have the site plan go through Plan and Zoning and City Council review and approval versus administratively and provide courtesy notices to the neighbors.

Council Member Sandager inquired why the tower wasn't constructed at that time. Mr. Denhert stated that when the site plan was approved initially for the station, the tower wasn't needed at that time. The tower is now needed for their radio system upgrades, specifically to support the microwave network that connects all their sites together.

Council Member Ohmart inquired how close a tower needs to be located to be utilized or can an existing tower elsewhere be utilized that's in close proximity.

Mr. Denhert answered is that one of the issues was the design of the microwave network and because of that the tower needs to be located on their site.

Council Member Sandager inquired how much it would be to install. Mr. Denhert replied that they haven't gone to bid yet but that they're expecting under \$100,000.

Council Member Ohmart queried if the tower could be designed to accommodate other carriers in the future as a way for the City to seek additional revenue.

Mr. Shires replied that over the years as the City has dealt with other carriers such as AT&T or US Cellular, they've indicated that a 75 foot tower is too short and prefer at least 100 feet or more. At that time the City did not wish to re-introduce the issue with the adjacent property owners as the City had gone through the zoning process for this property. An option available to them is to amend the PUD to allow 100 foot communication towers which may interest additional carriers.

Photographs were provided which illustrated the physical appearance of the proposed communications tower. Mr. Denhert added that EMS co-locates on the tower at Station #21 currently. He did note that the equipment for the microwave network needs to be located outside the pole and at least the 75 foot level.

Brief discussion was held regarding the physical structure of the communication tower and what the other carriers typically need for their equipment.

Mr. Denhert commented added that if an additional 25 feet is added to the 75 foot tower, the additional cell antennas could be disguised within the pole.

Council Member Ohmart expressed that the reason he commented regarding designing the tower to accommodate future carriers is so that everyone doesn't install their own tower and the City could limit the total number of towers in the area.

Council Member Sandager clarified that the options include: (1.) Administrative review and approve the request for a 75 foot communications tower and design it for future expansion. (2.) Do a courtesy notice on the 75 foot communications tower and review and approval at a Commission and Council level. (3.) Amend the PUD for a 100-120 foot communications tower which would include public hearing notices for the neighboring property owners.

Mr. Denhert added that they have had interest from carriers in the past, the most recent being AT&T, to co-locate on the tower.

Council Member Ohmart suggested that Mr. Denhert perform additional research to determine what the interested cell providers would need in order to co-locate on the tower and the costs associated with constructing a 100 to 120 foot tower versus a 75 foot tower.

Mr. Shires clarified that staff will work with Mr. Denhert to determine the options for a tower. At a minimum, courtesy notices will be sent. And if proposing to increase the height of the tower, public hearings notices will be sent for hearings before the Plan and Zoning Commission and City Council.

*Direction: The Council Members requested staff to work with Mr. Denhert to determine the best options for a communications tower and based upon that, will send courtesy notices or public hearing notices, if the PUD is to be amended.*

### 3. Upcoming Projects

- **Legacy at Bridgewood North Plat 3** – Grayhawk Homes of Iowa, Inc. is requesting final plat approval to subdivide the property into 14 lots for townhome development on property located south of Beechtree Lane on 80<sup>th</sup> Street.
- **Easton at Bridgewood North Plat 3** – Grayhawk Homes of Iowa, Inc. is requesting final plat approval to subdivide the property into eight (8) lots for townhome development on property located south of Beechtree Lane on 79<sup>th</sup> Street. Both final plats for Legacy and Easton are consistent with the previously approved preliminary plat and site plan.
- **South Maple Grove Plat 13** – Maplewood, LLC (Signature Real Estate Services, Inc.) is requesting preliminary plat and revised site plan approval to subdivide the property into 10 lots for multi-family development on the west half of the partially developed former Triton project, Village at Maple Bend, located on the southwest corner of Oxford Drive and 89<sup>th</sup> Street.
- **Amanda the Panda Grief Support Center** – Amanda the Panda has submitted a Minor Modification request to renovate the former Hospice of Central Iowa building at 1821 Grand Avenue for their grief support and counseling center for children. The major item of concern for this site is making sure the center has adequate parking.

### 4. Other Matters

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 a.m. The next Development and Planning City Council Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 21, 2013.

---

Christopher Shires, Development Planning  
and Inspection Manager

---

Michelle Riesenberg, Recording Secretary